1 2 3 4 5 6 7	BOIES SCHILLER FLEXNER LLP David Boies (pro hac vice to be filed) 333 Main Street Armonk, NY 10504 Tel: (914) 749-8200 dboies@bsfllp.com Mark C. Mao, SBN 236165 Beko Reblitz-Richardson, SBN 238027 44 Montgomery St., 41st Floor San Francisco, CA 94104 Tel: (415) 293-6800	BOIES SCHILLER FLEXNER LLP Alison L. Anderson, SBN 275334 Samantha Parrish, SBN 318681 2029 Century Park East, Suite 1520 Los Angeles, CA 90067 Tel: (213) 629-9040 alanderson@bsfllp.com sparrish@bsfllp.com Michael Mitchell (pro hac vice to be filed) 1401 New York Ave, NW Washington, DC 20005
8	mmao@bsfllp.com brichardson@bsfllp.com	Tel: 202 237 2727 mmitchell@bsfllp.com
9	James Lee (<i>pro hac vice</i> to be filed)	
10	100 SE 2nd St., 28th Floor Miami, FL 33131	
11	Tel: (305) 539-8400	
12	jlee@bsfllp.com	
13	Attorneys for Plaintiffs Mary Jane Whalen, Monica Meiloaica, and Chasom Brown,	
14	individually and on behalf of all others	
15	similarly situated	
16	UNITED STATES I	DISTRICT COURT
17	NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA	
18	MARY JANE WHALEN, MONICA	Case No.: 3:25-cv-04522
19	MEILOAICA, and CHASOM BROWN,	
20	individually and on behalf of all others similarly situated,	PLAINTIFFS' ADMINISTRATIVE MOTION TO CONSIDER WHETHER
21	Plaintiffs,	CASES SHOULD BE RELATED PURSUANT TO CIVIL L.R. 3-12 AND 7-11
22	V.	TOROUMINI TO CIVIL DING 5-12 MIND 7-11
23	EPIQ SYSTEMS, INC., ANGEION GROUP	
24	LLC, JND LEGAL ADMINISTRATION, HUNTINGTON NATIONAL BANK,	
25	WESTERN ALLIANCE BANK, and DOES 1-	
26	20, Defendants.	
27		
28		1
	PLAINTIFFS' ADMINISTRAT	TIVE MOTION TO CONSIDER

1 2

3

4

5

67

8

11

12

10

13 14

15 16

17 18

19

2021

2223

24

25

26

27

28

PLAINTIFFS' ADMINISTRATIVE MOTION TO CONSIDER WHETHER CASES SHOULD BE RELATED PURSUANT TO CIVIL L.R. 3-12 AND 7-11

Pursuant to Rule 3-12 and Rule 7-11 of the Civil Local Rules, Mary Jane Whalen, Monica Meiloaica and Chasom Brown ("Plaintiffs"), individually and as representatives of classes of similarly situated persons, move the Court to consider whether a case should be related to this matter, as follows. Defendant Epiq Systems, Inc. consents to the relief requested by this motion.¹

TITLE AND CASE NUMBER OF EACH APPARENTLY RELATED CASE

Plaintiffs are parties in *Whalen et al v. Epiq Systems, Inc. et al*, Case No. 3:25-cv-04522 ("*Whalen* Action"), the first-filed action.

Plaintiffs move the Court to consider whether *Rieger v. Epiq Systems, Inc. et al*, Case No. 3:25-cv-04793 ("*Rieger* Action"), the later-filed action, should be related to the *Whalen* action and assigned to this Court. Attached as Exhibit A is a copy of the complaint filed in the *Rieger* Action.

BRIEF STATEMENT OF THE RELATIONSHIP OF THE ACTIONS

Civil Local Rule 3-12(a) provides that actions are related when: (1) they concern substantially the same parties, property, transaction, or event; and (2) it appears likely that there will be an unduly burdensome duplication of labor and expense or conflicting results if these cases are conducted before different judges in this District.

The *Rieger* Action is related to the *Whalen* Action because: (a) both actions assert the same claims against substantially the same defendants; (b) both actions arise from the same underlying event, i.e., Defendants' unlawful scheme to reap hundreds of millions of dollars in undisclosed kickbacks and compensation through class administration services, depressing payouts for members of those class actions; and (c) if the Actions proceed independently of each other, it will result in unduly burdensome and duplicative motions and discovery because the

¹ All remaining Defendants either have not been served or did not respond to Plaintiffs' request for their position.

complaints raise substantially the same questions of fact and law.

Plaintiffs filed the *Whalen* Action in this District on May 28, 2025, against defendants Epiq Systems, Inc., Angeion Group LLC, JND Legal Administration, Huntington National Bank, and Western Alliance Bank.

The *Rieger* Action was later filed in this District on June 5, 2025, against the same defendants in the *Whalen* Action and one additional defendant, Kroll Settlement Administration LLC.

With near-identical language, both Actions assert the same nine claims: (1) Breach of Fiduciary Duty; (2) Fraud; (3) Sherman Act, Section 1; (4) Sherman Act, Section 1; (5) RICO; (6) RICO Conspiracy; (7) Breach of Implied Contract; (8) Unjust Enrichment/Quantum Meruit; and (9) Unfair Competition Law, Cal. Bus. & Prof. Code § 17200 et. seq.

Each of these claims are predicated on the same underlying event—the defendants' covert, anticompetitive agreements to divert settlement deposits in exchange for secret kickbacks that amounted to hundreds of millions of dollars. The Actions assert that this arrangement was made despite the claims administrator defendants' knowledge that the bank defendants pay a lower rate of interest on settlement deposits compared to other similarly situated banks that do not pay kickbacks, thereby depressing the ultimate payout for class members in the class actions. Both Actions assert the same or substantially identical factual allegations against the defendants and seek near identical relief including an order certifying a class action, injunctive and equitable relief, damages, interest, and attorneys' fees and costs.

Given the substantially similarity between the parties, claims, and factual allegations, not only is there a high risk of directly conflicting results, but also there is a high risk of unduly burdensome duplication of labor and expense for the judiciary and the parties involved if these Actions are conducted before different Judges.

CONCLUSION

Both criteria of Civil Local Rule 3-12(a) are satisfied such that consolidation before a single judge will prevent conflicting results and conserve judicial resources and the parties'

1	resources. Accordingly, Plaintiffs respectfully request that this Court find the Reiger and Whalen
2	Actions related and assign the <i>Reiger</i> Action to this Court where the first-filed <i>Whalen</i> Action is
3	pending.
4	
5	Dated: July 1, 2025 By: <u>/s/ Mark C. Mao</u> Mark C. Mao
6	BOIES SCHILLER FLEXNER LLP
7	David Boies (<i>pro hac vice</i> to be filed) 333 Main Street
8	Armonk, NY 10504
9	Tel: (914) 749-8200 dboies@bsfllp.com
10	
11	Mark C. Mao, SBN 236165 Beko Reblitz-Richardson, SBN 238027
12	44 Montgomery St., 41st Floor San Francisco, CA 94104
13	Tel: (415) 293-6800
14	mmao@bsfllp.com brichardson@bsfllp.com
15	James Lee (<i>pro hac vice</i> to be filed)
16	100 SE 2nd St., 28th Floor
17	Miami, FL 33131 Tel: (305) 539-8400
18	jlee@bsfllp.com
19	Alison L. Anderson, SBN 275334 Samantha Parrish, SBN 318681
20	2029 Century Park East, Suite 1520 Los Angeles, CA 90067
21	Tel: (213) 629-9040
22	alanderson@bsfllp.com sparrish@bsfllp.com
23	Michael Mitchell (<i>pro hac vice</i> to be filed)
24	1401 New York Ave, NW
25	Washington, DC 20005 Tel: 202 237 2727
26	mmitchell@bsfllp.com
27	
	4
28	PLAINTIFFS' ADMINISTRATIVE MOTION TO CONSIDER

